

Mr. Archer, placing the salaries of the judges at \$3,500 instead of \$4,000.

Mr. Wilkinson moved to go into committee of the whole, which motion gave rise to a desultory discussion, after which it was disagreed to.

Mr. Mackubin then took the floor in reply to the argument of Mr. Archer on last evening. He thought that the facts on which the arguments of the gentleman were based were much more fallacious than those of the advocates of the majority report, as charged by the gentleman. Mr. M. reviewed the statements of Mr. Archer as to the relative number of cases tried in the Court of Appeals under the old and the new systems, and the arguments of the latter in favor of an Independent Court of Appeals, and also advocated a return to the three-judge system. It was no experiment.

Mr. McKaig said if the proposition to have an independent Court of Appeals prevailed he should move to strike out the four associate judges, and leave but one, and he would contend for this on the same process of reasoning by which his friends from Harford (Messrs. Archer and Farnandis) arrived at the conclusion that the one-judge system was preferable to the three-judge system. They said it was cheaper, therefore one judge of the Court of Appeals would be cheaper than five. [Laughter.] Mr. McK. then argued in favor of the three-judge system, and maintained that under it there would be much less necessity and occasion for carrying cases to the Appeal Court.

Mr. Merrick said if the opponents of the three-judge system had foreborne their assaults until the workings of the system could have been fully developed, they would have spared themselves the vain beatings against the air which they had indulged in. They had conjured up objections which the friends of the system did not intend should arise. The different opponents of this system had made diverse objections which answered each other. Some contended that the duties of the chief judges in the Appeal Court would be so laborious that they would not have time to attend to their circuit duties, and others contended that the duties of the chief judges in the circuits